

Exhibit 18

Raina M. Abaya

From: Sarah B. Faulkner
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2015 8:43 PM
To: 'Uriarte, Robert L.'; Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob,

I write to follow-up on our conversation yesterday.

1. Financial projections for Google's non-Android, non-mobile lines of business

First, as I stated on our call, Oracle's request comes too late. I stated in my email of November 9, 2015 to Lisa Simpson that, in spite of Google's relevance objections and in the spirit of compromise, Google would produce - and has produced - "from non-custodial sources responsive, non-privileged documents maintained in the ordinary course of business reflecting projected revenues for Google's mobile business." Thus, Oracle has been aware of Google's position since at least November 9, 2015. Oracle should have raised this issue prior to the close of discovery.

Second, as I stated on our call, Google does not believe financial projections of any kind are relevant to the issues in this case. Google has communicated this position to Oracle several times, including in our meet and confer of October 16, 2015 and in my email of November 9, 2015, when I stated: "We are now 10 years beyond the date of the hypothetical negotiation, so any recent revenue projection is irrelevant to a hypothetical license. For the same reason, the logic of Judge Ryu's order - even if it applied to copyright damages - would not apply here. Google's revenue projections are also not relevant to Oracle's lost profits claim, which will stand or fall based on evidence of Oracle's own products, services, and business capacity. Further, Judge Alsup's January 9, 2012 Order made clear that post-verdict damages will be based only on the jury's findings regarding pre-verdict damages, not on Google's projected or actual future revenues." I then further stated Google's position that projected revenues were not relevant to the market harm prong of the fair use defense or bad faith. Google's position has not changed.

You stated that the non-Android financial projections are relevant to the modeling Oracle's experts are doing for damages and to show the commercial nature of the infringement. Oracle's damages argument was addressed in my response of November 9, 2015, as repeated above. The theory that financial projections for Google's non-Android lines of business bear on the commercial nature of the infringement is new, but meritless. Google financial data may be relevant to whether Android is commercial in nature, but Oracle already has Google financial data from the inception of Android to the end of 2015 to make that argument, as well as the PnLs for all of Google's non-Android lines of business. Future financial projections provide no incremental proof of Android's commercial nature.

Third, I told you I would inquire whether Google could and would provide this information, to the extent it exists, notwithstanding its relevance objections. I can confirm that, as Oracle's financial designee Edward Senteno testified is true for Oracle, Google does not establish financial projections in the normal course of its business other than during its process of planning for the immediate next fiscal year. With respect to FY 2016, which begins in January, Google is still in the process of developing these projections, and thus does not have any such financial projections beyond Q4 2015.

2. "Future" Products

First, as I stated on our call, Google's position on what it would produce as to future products has been clear since at least November 9, 2015, when I stated that, in spite of Google's relevance objections and in the spirit of compromise, Google would "collect and produce relevant executive presentations and product plans that reflect Google's plans with respect to

future mobile products." Google's position has not changed, nor did Ms. Simpson respond to my email of November 9, 2015 or ever otherwise question Google's agreement to produce.

Second, as I stated on our call, Google does not believe this information is relevant to the issues in this case. As I stated in the meet and confer of October 16, 2015, future products may never become actual products, and therefore this evidence is speculative.

Third, you inquired about two such "future products" and asked whether we were producing documents on those. First, as to "Android versions using OpenJDK," we have produced relevant, non-privileged documents and other materials, including Source Code for inspection at KVN's offices, which I understand Oracle has inspected multiple times. As for custodial documents, if any responsive, non-privileged documents have been collected in connection with the custodial searches agreed to by the parties, those documents have been or will be produced. Further, I understand Oracle deposed Anwar Ghuloum, whose custodial documents were produced, on this very topic. I note that Google disclosed its development of Android versions using OpenJDK on November 12, 2015, and it is now the eve of the close of discovery. The time for requesting additional ESI search terms has passed. Second, you also asked about a purported project to "port Android to desktop." It is unclear to what you are referring.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Regards, Sarah

From: Uriarte, Robert L. [mailto:ruriarte@orrick.com]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 4:06 PM
To: Sarah B. Faulkner; Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Ok, sorry about that. We will be on the line at 4:15.

Rob

From: Sarah B. Faulkner [mailto:SFaulkner@kvn.com]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 4:05 PM
To: Uriarte, Robert L.; Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob,

That's short notice. I am on another call, but I can call in at 4:15 pm.

Thanks - Sarah

From: Uriarte, Robert L. [mailto:ruriarte@orrick.com]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 4:00 PM
To: Sarah B. Faulkner; Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Hi Sarah. We can join a call now. Please use my dial in:

(866) 244-1129
Passcode: 8248 040#

Thanks

Rob

From: Sarah B. Faulkner [<mailto:SFaulkner@kvn.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 11:20 AM
To: Uriarte, Robert L.; Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob,

I write to follow-up on conferring as to the following two issues on Oracle's agenda that were not addressed on Friday:

- Financial Projections RFPs (RFPs 229, 230, 234-239, 251)
- Future products RFPs (RFPs 211, 219, 220, 221, 230, 239)

Can you meet at 4 pm today?

Thanks - Sarah

From: Uriarte, Robert L. [<mailto:ruriarte@orrick.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 3:30 PM
To: Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Ok, we are calling in now. Some of us may have to drop quickly but lets see what we can resolve and then we can reconvene later if necessary

From: Beth Egan [<mailto:BEgan@kvn.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 3:07 PM
To: Uriarte, Robert L.; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob,

We would prefer to keep with the 3:30 start time because two of our team members have hard stops at 5 PST. Can we begin the call and at least cover the issues that we can with those who are available? Otherwise, we will agree to begin at 4:30 but can't guarantee our team members can stay on to cover the issues.

Thanks,
Beth

From: Uriarte, Robert L. [<mailto:ruriarte@orrick.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 3:49 PM
To: Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Hi Beth. Apologies, but we need to push this call to 4:30. Please let us know if that doesn't work for your team.

Thanks

Rob

From: Beth Egan [<mailto:BEgan@kvn.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 2:12 PM
To: Uriarte, Robert L.; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob,

Thanks for the agenda. We will be prepared to address the issues you list below, with the exception of Annette's email to Dan Purcell sent this morning. Dan is in deposition today and will respond to Annette separately with regard to those issues.

Thanks,
Beth

From: Uriarte, Robert L. [<mailto:ruriarte@orrick.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 12:03 PM
To: Beth Egan; Steven Ragland
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Thanks Beth.

Here are the issues we would like to discuss:

- Oracle's motion for protective order re: IBM deposition
- Missing Google financial documents (see Annette's prior email)
- Source code production/inspection
- Android download metrics (see Alyssa's prior email)
- Apple agreement(s) (see Alyssa's prior email)
- Financial Projections RFPs (RFPs 229, 230, 234-239, 251)
- Future products RFPs (RFPs 211, 219, 220, 221, 230, 239)

Please use my dial in (866) 244-1129
Passcode 8248 040#

Rob

From: Beth Egan [<mailto:BEgan@kvn.com>]
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2015 8:01 PM
To: Steven Ragland; Uriarte, Robert L.
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: RE: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob,

To follow up on Steven's email, Sarah Faulkner and I are available tomorrow at 3:30 PST for a meet and confer call.

I had not yet received any response to my email (attached) requesting a meet and confer tomorrow concerning Oracle's responses to the RFAs and RFPs referred to in my email. The attached email outlines the issues we intend to raise on tomorrow's call. I understand that Oracle would like to raise issues relating to Google's RFP responses that would not be resolved by any pending compromise over search terms. Could you please send us a brief agenda by tomorrow morning of the issues you intend to raise so that we can prepare to address those issues?

Thanks,
Beth

From: Steven Ragland
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2015 6:52 PM
To: Uriarte, Robert L.
Cc: Edward A. Bayley; Beth Egan; DALVIK-KVN; Oracle/Google-OHS Only
Subject: Re: Oracle v Google- Meet and Confer Call

Rob-

I thought we left it that you were going to reach out to Beth and/or Sarah to set up a time. Regardless, one of them will get back to you on this shortly.

Thanks,
--Steven

On Dec 10, 2015, at 3:17 PM, Uriarte, Robert L. <ruriarte@orrick.com> wrote:

Ed and team:

Yesterday we asked you to propose a time for today for a call to meet and confer regarding remaining discovery disputes. As it doesn't look like that call is going to happen today, please propose some times for tomorrow. Our team is available after 3:30 pacific.

Thanks

Rob



ROBERT L. URIARTE
Managing Associate

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015

tel +1-650-289-7105
fax +1-650-614-7401
ruriarte@orrick.com
[bio](#) • [vcard](#)

www.orrick.com

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.